9'4 V/10

~~23560~~
2368

SOME WESTERN INDOLOGISTS AND INDIAN CIVILIZATION

KAILASH CHANDRA VARMA

International Academy of Indian Culture
New Delhi, 1971.

वर्ग संख्या E 143
प्राप्ति-संख्या २368
ग्रन्थ-कार्ड
श्री गणेश वर्णी दि० जैन (शोध) संस्थान
ग्रन्थागार
नरिया, वाराणसी-५
ग्रन्थ नाम Some Western Indologists and Indian civilization
लेखक कैलाशचन्द

E 143
2368

कृपया इस ग्रन्थको निम्नांकित तिथि पर या उसके पूर्व
लौटा दें। विलम्बसे लौटानेपर ५ पैसे
प्रतिदिन दण्ड देना होगा।

1

KAILASH CHANDRA VARMA

SOME WESTERN INDOLOGISTS AND INDIAN CIVILIZATION

The work done by many European and American scholars in unravelling the past of India, by the study of Sanskrit and other Indian languages, the decipherment of the Brāhmī script and adding to the study of epigraphy contributed to the renaissance in Indian thought and culture in the nineteenth century. In particular scholars like Sir Charles Wilkins[1], Sir William Jones[2], Sir Thomas Colebrooke[3], Friedrich Schlegal[4], James Princep[5], August Wilhelm Von Schlegel[6], Franz Bopp[7], Wilhelm Humbolt[8],

---

[1] Translator (into English) of the *Bhagavadgitā*, *Hitopadeśa*, Śakuntalā episode from the *Mahābhārata*, all between 1785: He also prepared a Sanskrit Grammar, in 1808.

[2] Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Calcutta, who, in 1789 translated Kalidasa's *Śakuntalā*, Text of *Ṛtusaṃhāra*, and in 1784, the *Manusmṛiti*. He also identified Sandrokotus of the Greek writers with Candragupta Maurya.

[3] Wrote extensively on Hindu Law, science, astronomy, grammar, philosophy and religious life; edited *Amarkoṣa*, *Kirātārjunīya*, *Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Hitopadeṣa*.

[4] Great German poet, learnt Sanskrit from Alexander Hamilton, between 1803-1807 and became the founder of Indian philology ('*Uber die sorache und Weisheit der Indier Ein Beitrag zur Begrundung der Altertumskunde.*')

[5] James princep was the first to read the Aśokan Brāhmī characters.

[6] First German Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, and started in 1823, the periodical *Indische Bibliothek* the first volume of which was almost from his pen and contained numerous papers on Indian philology; a good edition of the *Bhagwaḍgitā* with Latin translation and in 1829, appeared his greatest but unfinished edition of Vālmiki's *Ramayaṇa*.

[7] Father of Comparative Philology, see his *Ueber das Conjugation-system der Sanskritsprache in Vergkeichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persuschen und germanischen Sprache*, translations of episodes from the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Sanskrit Grammar*, *Glossarium Sanscritum* (Berlin 1830).

[8] His work on the *Bhagavadgītā* is remarkable.

Friedrich Ruckert[9], Eugene Burnouf[10], Major General Sir Alexander Cunningham[11], Franz Keilhorn[12], Hermann Jacobi[13], Major Seymour Sewell[14], and many others[15] will always be remembered by the students of Indian history with gratitude and admiration. These scholars, poets, archaeologists and military officers, devoted themselves to their self-appointed labour of love and inspite of many inevitable but bonafide mistakes, their work has a permanent value in Indic studies. All honour to them. Unfortunately, however, coeval with the serious and dispassionate study of Sanskrit and various aspects of Indology by the scholars enumerated, there was another band of scholars whose labours, though valuable in many respects, have been vitiated by political or religious theological bias. In short, the latter band of scholars were not objective in their studies but were propagandists for the perpetuation of foreign domination of India and endeavoured to convert India to what they considered to be the true 'faith'. It is rather strange that an appreciable number of Western authors who have written about India during the last half a century or so, have been inspired mainly by the latter band. The inevitable result has been gross misrepresentation of India and the Indians, particularly the Hindus, in the Western world and specially in the English-speaking world and the United States of America. The object of this paper is to analyze their writings and to show how, some among them were guided in their study of Indian Culture by motives other than scholarly.

---

[9] Noted German Poet. His translations from Indian Classical Sanskrit Poetry, re-edited by H. von Glasenapp, *Indische Liebeslyrik*, Munchen, 1921. He was a master translator of Indian poetry.

[10] Prof. of Sanskrit, College de France, teacher of Rudolf Roth and F. Max Muller along with Christian Lassen laid the foundation of study of Pali and Buddhist literature.

[11] of the Royal Engineers, First Director General of Archaeology. His 23 volumes of Indian Antiquities, are monumental and unsurpassed in the Archaeological Library of the World.

[12] Editor of Pātñjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, perhaps the greatest Western Master of Sanskrit Grammar, made numerous contributions to Indian epigraphy, Editor of the *Grundriss der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde (Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Philology and Archaeology*). G. Bühler was the first editor, Kielhorn succeeded him.

[13] Prof. of Sanskrit, Univ. of Bonn. Perhaps the greatest European authority on Jainism, great Vedic scholar; also an authority on *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, and his work *Das Ramāyāṇa* remains a standard work on the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki.

[14] Author of the 'History of the Vijayanagar Empire'.

[15] Other noted scholars who laboured in the cause of Indic studies, were, H.H. Wilson, Ralph Griffith, Adolf Kaegi, R. Pischel, Karl F. Geldner, Heinrich Lüders, Sten Konow Charles Lanman, M. Bloomfield, Theodor Goldstucker, Alfred Ludwig, Hermann Oldenberg, Sylvain Lévi, S. Oldenberg, Emile Senart, A. Bergagine, A. Barth, Christian Lassen, H. Grassmann, Martin Haugh, Paul Deussen, Paul Dahlke, T.W. Rhys Davids, Lord Chalmers, E.J. Thomas, Julius Eggling, and others.

I. Europe was aroused to the beauty of Sanskrit literature by the English translation of *Śakuntalā* of Kālidāsa by Sir William Jones in 1789. Goethe, the German poet-dramatist, who is undoubtedly the greatest literary figure in the Western World, expressed about *Meghadūta* and *Śakuntalā* of Kālidāsa thus:

(a *About Meghadūta*:[16]

"Was will man denn vergnuglicheres wissen
Sakontala, Nala, die muss man kussen;
Und Meghaduta, den Wolkengesandten,
Wer schickt ihn nicht gern zu seelenverwandten.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

"What more pleasant, shall we know,
Thank Sakuntala, Nala, that we must kiss;
And Meghaduta, the cloud messenger,

---

[16] M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, (Eng. Tr.) vol. III, Pt. 1, p. 120. Alexander von Humbolt also refers to the beauty of description of the rainy season, in the *Meghadūta*. Goethe admired greatly *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva (*Ibid*., p. 146).

Who is there who will not like to send him to his soul !"

(b) *About Śakuntalā*:

Willst du die Blute des fruhen die
Fruchte des spateren Jahres,
Willst du, was reizt und entuzckt,
Willst du, was sattigt und nahrt,
Willst du den Hummel, die erde mit
Einem Namen begreifen,
Nein'ich Sakuntala, dich, und
dann ist alles gesagt.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

"In case you desire to rejoice in the
blossoms of early years,
the fruits of age advanced,
In case you want to have something that charms
something that is enchanting
In case you want to call both heaven and
earth by a common name,
I refer to you Śakuntalā
And thus I describe these all."[17]

II. Many years later, Goethe wrote, to Chezy, the French editor of the text of *Śakuntalā*:[18] "When for the first time I became aware of this work of unfathomable depth, I was filled with great enthusiasm and it attracted me in such a manner that even at the time when I had hardly finished its reading, it goaded me towards the impossible undertaking of adapting it, even approachingly, for the German theatre... I am still carrying the ineffaceable impression, that this book made on me so early. Here the poet seems to be at the height of his talents in representation of the natural order, of the finest mode of life, of the purest moral endeavour, of the most worthy sovereign and of the most sober divine meditation; still he remains in such a manner the lord and master of his creation."

---

[17] Winternitz, *Ibid.*, pp. 237-238; A.W. Ryder, *Śakuntalā*, Everyman's Library, No. 629, 1928 (facing contents).

[18] Winternitz, *Ibid.*, p. 238; Letter dated Oct. 9, 1830, published in Hirezel's translations and in Goethe's *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, Abt. IV, Bd. 17, p. 284 ff.

III. Another illustrious German, Schiller, wrote to Wilhelm von Humbolt,[19] "that there is no poetical presentation of womanhood or of more beautiful a life in the whole of Greek antiquity, that might reach the *Śakuntalā* even from a distance". The celeberated Wilhelm von Humbolt ranked *Bhagavadgītā* above the works of Lucretius, Parmenides and Empedokles, and declared, "that this episode of the *Mahābhārata* is the most beautiful, nay perhaps the only truly philosophical poem which we can find in all the literatures known to us."[20] Again he wrote to Fr. von Gentz in 1827, about the *Bhagavadgītā:* "It is perhaps the deepest and loftiest thing the world has to show."[21]

IV. The admiration of German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer for the *Upaniṣads*, which he studied from a Latin translation made by a French writer, Antuetil du erron, from the Persian translation known as the *Sirre-Akbar* made by Prince Dara Shikoh, son of the Mughal Emperor Shahjehan, is well known.[22]

V. Similarly the tribute paid to Kālidāsa by A.W. Ryder, is remarkable; he writes: "Kālidāsa ranks not with Anacreon and

---

[19] Winternitz, *Hist. of Indian Literature*, Eng. Trs. vol. III, Pt. 1, p. 238.

[20] *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 426-427.

[21] *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 17.

[22] *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 266-267.

Horace and Shelley but with Sophocles, Virgil and Milton;"[23] and again "We know that Kālidāsa is a very great poet, because the world has not been able to leave him alone."[24]

VI. H.G. Wells also has placed Buddha and Aśoka among the six greatest men the world has so far seen.[25]

VII. Vincent Arthur Smith, no partisan of India, observes, "A recent Indian author justly observes that 'India suffers today in the estimation of the world more through that world's ignorance of the achievements of the heroes of Indian history than through the absence or insignificance of such achievements."[26] Again he pays his tribute to Aśoka, "This great result is the work of Aśoka alone and entitles him to rank for all time with that small body of men who may be said to have changed the faith of the world."[27]

But this stream dried up fairly soon, though now and then some one sometimes objectively endeavoured to study about India and the Indians.

VIII. Writing about the Buddha, Edwin A. Burtt, Sage Professor of Philosophy at Cornell University, observes "Gautama the Buddha seems to have combined in a high degree two qualities that are rarely found together and each of which is rarely exemplified in high degree. On the one hand he was a man of rich and responsive human sympathy, of unfailing patience, strength, gentleness, and good will...... He therefore aroused in his followers a wondering, eager, affectionate devotion such as only the greatest leaders of men have awakened. On the other hand, he was a thinker, of unexcelled philosophic power. His was one of the giant intellects of human history, exhibiting a keenness of analytic understanding that has rarely been equalled."[28]

---

[23] A.W. Ryder, *Kālidāsa,, Translations of Shakuntala and other works*, Everyman's Library, No. 629, 1928, Introduction, p. XX.

[24] *Ibid.*, (Introduction) p. XXI.

[25] H.G. Wells, also see his *A History of the World*, 1961, p. 395 and 401.

[26] *Early History of India*, IIIrd Ed., 1914, p. 3.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

The other band of scholars were, however, interested in the continued political subjection of India and a good many hoped to convert Indians to the 'true faith'.

I. One of the first fruits of their endeavours was the creation of the Boden Professorship of Sanskrit, at the University of Oxford. The special objective of this foundation, as described by Sir Monier Williams was:[29] "to enable his countrymen to proceed in the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian Religion..."

II. Even Horace Hayman Wilson, the noble minded translator of the *Ṛgveda*, and the first holder of the Boden Professorship, was so bound by the terms of appointment that he was forced to admit[30] the reason for writing the book *The Religious and Philosophical System of the Hindus*, in order "to help candidates for a prize of 1200/- given by John Muir, a well known old Haileybury man and great Sanskrit scholar, for the *best refutation* of the Hindu Religious System."

III. Rudolf Roth,[31] one of the joint editors of the *St. Petersburg*

---

[28] *Teachings of the Compassionate Buddha* (Mentor Books), No. MD 131, 1955, Introduction, p. 22.

[29] *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 1899, Preface, p. IX.

[30] *Eminent Orientalists*, Madras, p. 72.

[31] Theodor Goldstucker, *Pāṇini* (His Place in Sanskrit Lit.), Allahabad ed, 1914, pp. 189-195.

(later Petrograd, now Leningrad) *Sanskrit-German Dictionary* gave as his considered opinion that a qualified European was in a better position to interpret the *Veda* than a Brahman due to the latter's theological bias. As an additional instance of his conceit he declared that with the aid of the 'German Science of Comparative Philology, he could interpret much better than Yāska, the hymns of the Veda.'[32]

IV. He was supported by the equally self-opinionated American Sanskrit scholar William Dwight Whitney, who stated that the "principles of the German School are the only ones which can ever guide us to a true understanding of the Veda."[33]

V. F. Max Müller, who also has done very valuable work by producing the Text of the *Ṛgveda* with the *Bhāshya* of Sāyaṇa and editing the *Sacred Books of the East* unfortunately was himself a bigotted and dogmatic Christian. Some of his fulminations make interesting reading as examples of a distorted judgement:

> (a) "History seems to teach that the whole human race required gradual education before, in the fullness of time, it could be admitted to the truths of Christianity... The religion of the Buddha has spread, far beyond the limits of the Aryan world, and, to our limited vision, it may seem to have retarded the advent of Christianity among a large portion of the human race. But in the sight of Him with whom a thousand years are but as one day, that religion, like the ancient religions of the world may have but served to prepare the way of Christ, by helping through its very errors to strengthen and to deepen the ineradicable yearning of the human heart after the truth of God.[34]

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 195; cited by Macdonell, *A. Hist. of Sanskrit Literature*, 1958 ed., p. 63.

[33] Bhagwad Datta, *Western Indologists; A Study in Motives*, 1954, p. 4.

[34] *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, 1859, p. 32.

(b) "A large number of Vedic hymns are childish in the extreme, low, commonplace."[35]

(c) The intensity of Max Müller's theological intolerance is further well illustrated by his virulent attack on Dr. Spiegel, who had expressed the opinion that, perhaps, the Biblical account of the creation of the universe had been borrowed from Iranian sources. Max Müller was so enraged at this that he wrote, "A writer like Dr. Spiegel should know that he can expect no mercy; nay, he should himself wish for no mercy, but invite the heaviest artillery against the floating battery which he has launched in the troubled waters of Biblical criticism."[36]

(d) About the Parsis, he (Max Müller) observed: "If inspite of all this, many people, most competent to judge, look forward with confidence to the conversion of the Parsis, it is because, in most essential points, they have already, though unconciously, approached as near as possible, to the pure doctrine of Christianity. Let them but read the *Zend-Avesta*, in which they profess to believe, and they will find that their faith is no longer the faith of the *Yasna*, the *Vendidad* and the *Vispered*. As historical relics, these works, if critically interpreted, will always remain a pre-eminent place in the great library of the ancient world. As oracles of religious faith, they are defunct and a mere anachronism in the age in which we live.[37]

(e) Again in a letter dated December 16, 1868, addressed to the Duke of Argyl, Under Secretary of State for India, Max Müller observed: "The ancient religion of India is doomed and if Christianity does not step in, whose fault will it be?"[38]

---

[35] Bhagwad Datta, (1954) *op. cit.*, p. 5, where he cites, Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop* II, Ed. 1866, p. 27.

[36] *Chips from a German Workshop*, 1891, Vol. I, p. 144 (*Genesis* and the *Zend-Avesta*).

[37] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, 1891, p. 177 (*The Modern Parsis*).

VI. Sir Monier Williams, to whom a reference has already been made, further expressed himself, as follows:[39]

---

[38] Bhagvad Datta, (1954) *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 9. He cites Monier Williams, *Modern India and Indian,* III ed. 1879, p. 261-262. This bigotry was typical of the English mind of the Nineteenth Century. For example (i) Bishop of Salisbury prosecuted Rowland Williams; and another Clergyman, Sendal, prosecuted H.B. Wilson, for heresy; both were acquitted by the Privy Council; the unanimous judgement was delivered by the Lord Chancellor but the Archbishops of Canterbury and York dissented. (*vide* A.W. Benn, *The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. II, pp. 132-33), (ii) *Ibid*, pp. 135-37, Bishop Colenso of Natal, subjected, (on questioning by an intelligent Zulu about the Bibilical miracles) the statement in Genesis that the number of Hebrews who went to Egypt with Jacob, multiplied, within a century from 70 to 600,000 fighting men, according to *Exodus*, and showed the unreliability of the account. A determined attempt to deprive him of his Bishopric was defeated by the British Government; (iii) Dr. Wace, Principal of the Kings College, *(Report of the Church Hist. Congress, Manchester, 1888)* declared that the Great Thomas Henry Huxley had no right to call himself an 'agnostic', when in reality he disbelieved in Jesus Christ, and his correct appellation was 'Infidel, and that it should be unpleasant for a man to say that he did not believe in Jesus Christ. Huxley in a devastating reply, completely turned the tables on the learned divine. (*Huxley's Lectures and Essays*, Thinkers Library, No. 17, 1931, p. 159). He asked Dr. Wace to define the creed to which he should plead infidelity and showed that any creed that may have been cited by the former, would have created a commotion in the early centuries of the Christian Era, in Palestine and other areas; and went on to remark that since Christians and Muslims, in their modesty, called each other 'Infidel', on Dr. Waces principles, both should call themselves 'Infidel'. The Protestant form of Christianity of which both Monier Williams and Max Müller were followers, is described thus by Cardinal Newman, in his *(An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 1878, pp. 7-8):— "...... The Christianity of history is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth it is this...... "To be deep in history is to cease to be a Protestant." Huxley in his essay, 'Agnosticism and Christianity", (*Lectures and Essays*, 1931, p. 217) observed, "I have

> (a) "Brahmanism, therefore, must die out. In point of fact, false ideas on the most ordinary scientific subjects are so mixed up with its doctrines that the commonest education the simplest lessons in geography without the aid of Christianity must inevitably in the end sap its foundations."
>
> (b) "When the walls of the mighty fortress of Brahmanism are encircled, undermined, and finally stormed by the soldiers of the cross, the victory of Christianity must be signal and complete.

VII. Winternitz also is not free from the theological bias: "It is true, the authors of these hymns rise but extremely seldom to the exalted flights and deep fervour of, say, the religious poetry of the Hebrews"[40]. Yet the upholders of the sublimity of the poetry of the *Old Testament*, never allude to the sublimity of the *Bhagavadgītā* or the other Vedic hymns. Compare the legend of creation in the *Old Testament* with the celebrated *Nāsadīya Sūkta* of the *Ṛgveda*:[41]

---

not a shadow of doubt that these anti-Protestant epigrams are profoundly true. But I have as little as that, in the same sense, the "Christianity of history is not" Romanism; and that to be deeper still is to cease to be a Romanist...... If with one hand Dr. Newman has destroyed Protestantism, he has annihilated Romanism with the other, and the total result of his ambidextrous efforts is to shake Christianity to its foundations." Similarly, the illustrious, Robertson Smith, author of the art. "Hebrew language and literature", in the *Encyclopaedea Brittanica*, 1880, and "*The Religion of Semites*", was driven out of the chair of Hebrew Professor, Free Church College, Aberdeen, even though he had been acquitted of the charge of 'heresy' (vide Lewis Spence, *An Introduction to Mythology*, also see A.W. Benn, *History of Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. I, 1906, p. 467).

[40] *History of Indian Literature* (Eng. Trs.), Calcutta, 1927, p. 79.

[41] *Ṛgveda* X, 129, (Translation of Max Müller, *Chips from a German workshop*, 1891, vol. I. pp. 76-77, quoted by V. Smith, *Oxford Hist. of Ind.* 20) also see *Ṛgveda*, X, 31, 7; X, 81, 2 and 4; X, 190; X, 82, 5-6, and many others.

Nor Aught nor Nought existed; yon bright sky
  Was not, nor heaven's broad woof outstretched above.
What covered all? What sheltered? What concealed?
  Was it the water's fathomless abysss?
There was not death—yet was there nought immortal,
  There was no difference betwixt day and night;
The Only One breathed breathless by itself;
  Other than it there nothing since has been.
... ...
Who knows the secret? who proclaimed it here
  Whence, whence this manifold creation sprang?
The gods themselves came later into being—
  who knows from whence this great creation sprang?
He from whom all this great creation came,
  Whether his will created or was mute,
The Most High Seer that is in the highest heaven
  He knows it, or per chance even He knows not?

VIII. Will Durant has commented on the above: "The loftiest of the poems is an astonishing Creation hymn, in which a subtle pantheism, even a pious scepticism, appears in this the oldest book, of the most religious of people."[42]

IX. Zénaïde A. Ragozin observes: "One of the great beauties of this matchless piece is that while reaching the uttermost bounds of philosophical abstraction, it is never obscure, unless to the absolutely uninitiated."[43]

It has extorted unwonted admiration even from Max Müller, "language blushes at, but her blush is a blush of triumph."[44]

---

[42] Will Durant, *Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage*, 1935 vol. I, p. 409.

[43] *Vedic India*, (*Story of Nations Series*), 1895, pp. 426-427.

[44] *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* 1859, pp. 559-664; Macdonell, *India's Past*, p. 9.

He goes on to observe, reluctantly: "there are hymns, though few in number, in the Veda, so full of thought and speculation that at this early period no poet in any other nation could have concieved them" *(Chips from the German Workshop*, 1891, Vol. I, pp. 76). In exactly similar manner, along with poetry and religious fervour of a high order, the *Old Testament* has hundreds of lines which breath such hatred and venon that they are unmatched and good deal of its poetry is as puerile as any. Will Durant's[45] characterisation of Yahweh (Jehovah), and the curses he hurls is not unjustified e.g. *Deuteronomy*, xxviii.16:

> "Cursed shall thou be in the City, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. . cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy hand...... The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation...... The Lord shall smite thee with the both of Egypt, and with the emerods (tumours), and the with scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst be healed. The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment

---

[45] See also Will Durant, *Story of Civilization*, vol. I, p. 310," "Apparently the conquering Jews took one of the gods of Caanan, Yahu, and recreated him in their own image as a stern, warlike, "stiff-necked" deity, with almost lovable limitations, For this god makes no claim to omniscience; he asks the Jews to identify their homes by sprinkling them with the blood of the sacrificial lamb, lest he should destroy their children unadvertently along with the first born of the Egyptians; he is not above making mistakes, of which man is his worst; he regrets, too late, that he created Adam, or allowed Saul to become king. He is now and then greedy, irascible, blood-thirsty, capricious, petulant: "I will be gracious to whom I shall be gracious, and will show mercy to whom I shall show mercy... His conscience is as flexible as that of a bishop in politics.. He slaughters whole nations... He is so ferocious that he thinks of destroying all the Jews for worshipping the golden calf; and Moses has to argue with him to control himself. "Turn from thy fierce wrath" the man tells his god, "and repent of this evil against thy people" and the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people.

> of heart.... Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the Book of the Law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, untill thou be destroyed."

X. The massive Sanskrit German Wörterbuch (St. Petersberg Dictionary) prepared by Rudolf Roth and Otto Bothlingk, was severely criticised by Prof. Goldstucker. This engraged A. Weber, so greatly, that he used extremely undignified, even abusive language against Goldstucker. The latter was reluctantly forced to expose the conspiracy between of Bothlingk, Roth, Weber and Kuhn, thus:

> "It will, of course, be my duty to show, at the earliest opportunity, that Dr. Bothlingk is incapable of understanding even easy rules of Pāṇini, much less those of Kātyāyana and still less capable of making use of them in the understanding of classical texts. The errors in his department of the dictionary are so numerous...... that it will fill every serious Sanskritist with dismay, when he calculates the mischevious influence which they must exercise on the study of Sanskrit philology."[47]
>
> "Questions which, in my mind, ought to be decided with very utmost circumspection, and which could not be decided without very laborious research have been trifled with in this Worterbuch in the most unwarranted manner.[48]

Again compelled by the unjustified attack on the Vedic tradition, Goldstucker, had to raise his voice against the mischevious propagandists camouflaged as critical scholars, "When I see that the most distinguished and the most learned Hindu

---

[46] Theodor Goldstucker, *Pāṇini, His Place in Sanskrit Lit.*, Alld ed. 1914, p. 200.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

scholars and divines—the most valuable and some times the only, source of all our knowledge of ancient India are scorned in theory, mutilated in print, and, as a consequence, set aside in the interpretation of Vaidik texts;——— ······ ———— when a clique of Sanskricists of this description vapours about giving us the sense of the Veda as it existed at the commencement of Hindu antiquity;—when I consider that this method of studying Sanskrit philology is pursued by those whose words apparently derive weight and influence from the professional position they hold; ...... then I hold that it would be want of courage and a dereliction of duty, if I did not make a stand against these Saturnalia of Sanskrit Philology."[49]

XI. Sir William Dampier[50]: had the audacity to write: "Perhaps the paucity of Indian contribution to other sciences (than philosophy and medicine) may in part be due to the Hindu region." Another writer is pleased to observe, "The curse of India is the Hindoo religion. More than two hundred million people believe a monkey-mixture of mythology that is strangling the nation." He who yearns for God in India soon looses his head as well as his heart"[51]. The writer has forgotten, it seems, the demonology of the Old and New Testament, which is believed in by many Americans and Europeans, even in these days of

---

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 204-05.

[50] The falsity of Dampier's views will be apparent from the following. Will Durant (*Hist. of Civ.* vol. I, p. 527) cites Christian Lassen, "It is India that gave us the ingenious method of expressing all numbers by ten symbols, each receiving a value position as well as an absolute value...... and we shall appreciate the grandeur of this achievement the more when we remember that it escaped the genius of Archimedes and Apollonias two of the greatest men produced by antiquity." The *Ṛgveda* (1,33,8, *Ait. Brāhmaṇa*, 14,6, *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, 9,10, recognised that the Earth was a globe and was located in the Universe without support (see S.B. Dixit, *Bhāratiya Jyotisa*, Hindi. Tr. 1957, pp. 30-31. Aryabhatta, anticipated Copernicus, by a thousand years, in the concept of Heliocentric theory (Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, vol. I, pp. 409-428; W. Sedgwick and H. Tyler, *Short History of Science*, 1927, p. 160. The concept of gravitation, not the Law of Gravitation, had been recognised (D.C. Mutty, *The Antiquity of Hindu Medicine and Civilization*, 1930, p. 97). Sarton, *Op. cit.*, p. 601

---

accepts that the so-called 'Arabic numerals' were the gift of India, and as such acknowledged by the Arabs. Though the Hindus were not as successful as the Greeks in Geometry, they had some knowledge of it as it was essential for their sacrificial vedis, and the so called Pythagorean theorem (it is now established that its attribution to him is mistaken) was known to them in the Vedic period. The value of π was worked out by Aryabhatta, to be 3.1416, and was not equalled till 1423-61, by Purbach (B.K. Sarkar, *Hindu Achievements in Exact Science*, 1918, p. 17). Aryabhatta, Brahmagupta, Bhaskara, invented the radical sign (D.C. Muthu *Op. cit.*, p. 92 and Sedgwick, *Op. cit.*, p. 157f); they created the concept of negative quantity, without which Algebra would have been impossible (D.C. Muthu, *Op. cit.*, p. 92; R.H. Lowie, *Are We Civilised*, p. 269 and B.K. Sarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 14)found the square root of $\sqrt{}$'2' and rules for permutations and combinations, and indeterminate equations of the second degree, which were not known in Europe till the days of Euler in the 18th cent. A.D. (Muthu, *Op. cit.*, 92, Sarkar, *Op. cit.*, 14-15) Atreya, anticipating Weissmann, by 2500 years, or more, propounded that the "seed" is independent of the parent's body and contain in itself, in miniature, the whole parental organism. Bhawa Misra, in the 16th cent. A.D. a hundred years earlier, discovered circulation of blood and prescribed preparations of mercury for the treatment of Syphlis, a gift of the Portugese to the world. Suṣuruta, not later than 600 B.C., described in his Samhitā, 121 surgical instruments, e.g. lancets, forcep cathetars, rectal and vaginal speculums. Rhinoplasty, of modern medicine is derived from him. According to Garrison, *History of Medicine*, Philadelphia, 1929, p. 29, the ancient Aryans performed almost every kind of major operation except the ligature of arteries. Nāgārjuna, 2nd cent. B.C. wrote on the chemistry of Mercury; by the 6th century A.D. in Chemistry, the Hindus were ahead of Europe and the famous Damascus blades were made from Indian steel, and they were ahead of Europe in many industries, e.g. glass, cement, soap, dyeing, tanning, in the days of Imperial Rome. In modern days, valuable contributions have been made by C.V. Raman, J.C. Bose, Chandrashekhar, Khurana, Ganesh Prasad, Ramanujam—*all Hindus* — and many others.

[51] Ripley's *Believe it or Not*, pt. 1, p. 14 (26th ed. Pocket Bks. Inc., New York).

enlightenment (vide, Reverend Montagu Summers, *The History of Witchcraft and Demonology)*, though the attendence in the churches has been declining over the years, and frequently the preacher is lucky if he gets an audience of twenty.

XII. Prof. McKenzie King also considers Indian ethics to be antisocial, illogical, defective and bereft of any philosophical metaphysical foundation, and goes on to observe that Hindu philosophical idealism, "when logically applied leave no room for ethics; and that they prevent the development of a strenuous moral life"[52].

Perhaps, with his background of superior European Christian morality which caused the massacres of even children by the Israelites, the prolonged wars of Religion in Europe, in which Catholics and Protestants (nay even their sects) fought and tore and massacred each other with unmatched ferocity, the Spanish conquest of Mexico and Peru, the institution of the 'Holy Inquisition', which murdered and burned at the stake, or hanged millions in Europe and the new world all in the name of their Prince of Peace and his Heavenly Father justifies him in hurling this reproach. Professor McKenzie King has conveniently ignored the judgement of Thomas Henry Huxley. "If we could only see, in one view, the torrents of hypocrisy and cruelty, the lies, the slaughter, the violations of every obligation of humanity, which have flowed from this source along the course of the history of Christian nations, our worst imaginations of Hell would pale beside the vision." *(Lectures and Essays*, Thinker's Library No. 17, p. 164).

XIII. Sir Mortimer Wheeler, supported by the redoubtable Stuart Piggott[53] and later by Sir Leonard Woolley[54] and A.L. Basham had decided that the invading hordes of savage Aryans, under the command of their OBERESTER-KRIEGSHERR, Indra, destroyed the Indus Civilization, and as it is a fixed article of belief among the majority of Western Indologists, that Aryans came to India, in the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C., the date of destruction of the Harappan civilization was made to coincide with that event.[53] Unfortunately for him, a fresh examination of the site, led Dr. George F. Dales to exenorate 'Indra and the Barbarian hordes'. (*Expedition*, Bulletin of Pennsylvania University, Museum, Vol. VI, No. 3, 1964, pp. 36-43). In his *Early India and Pakistan* Wheeler remarks: "It is just possible that Aśoka had Seleucid blood in his veins." B.B. Lal, has shown the absurd consequences that follow from this statement, since it would make Bindusāra, a father at the age of ten years[55]. As usual, Wheeler has not cited any evidence for his statement. Vincent Smith quotes with disapproval from a German author, Niese, that Chandragupta Maurya accepted the sovereignty of Saleukos—the phrase used is "die Oberhoheit des Seleukos anerkannte"—inspite of the fact that contemporary Greek and Roman writers definitely mention that Seleukos was compelled to cede large territories to the great Mauryan Emperor[56]. It may also be stated that the evidence available does not support the statement that a daughter of Seleukos was married to the Indian monarch[57]. Alexander is proclaimed by almost all writers as the victor of the battle of Hydaspes (Jhelum river), but none of the western writers had ever hinted that there is a rival Ethiopian version, which states that it was Alexander who lost the battle. The only writer who has referred to this version is Prof. H.C. Seth (*Indian History Congress*, Allahabad Session, 1938, pp. 85-91). It is also a well recognized fact that whenever the Greeks met the Persians in the battle and happened to be victorious, they had superiority both in numbers and armaments.

---

[52] E. Washburn Hopkins, *Ethics of India*, 1024, Preface, pp. x -xi.

[53] *Ancient India*, No. 3, 1947, pp. 78-83 ('Indra stands accused' is on page 82), S. Piggott, *Prehistoric India* (Penguin, 1950), pp. 262-263.

[54] *Early India and Pakistan*, 1958, p. 170.

---

[55] *Antiquity*, vol. XXXIV, Sep. 1960, 226 — A review of Wheeler's *Early India and Pakistan.*

[56] Vincent Smith, *Early History of India*, IIIrd ed., 1914, p. 119 and Footnote No. 2 of the same. Mr. Bevan, in his (*'The House of Seleucus'*, 1902, vol. I, p. 296) had challenged the statement about cessation of territory made by Seleucos, to the Mauryan Emperor (V. Smith, "*Asoka*", p. 66). In justification, Vincent Smith has four Greek passages from Strabo I, Strabo II, Appian, Plutarch and two Latin from Justin and Pliny, in Appendix F, pp, 150-151, of his *Early Hist. of India,* which prove definitely that what we know today as Afghanistan and Baluchistan had been ceded by Seleukos. He also points out on p. 119, of his history, that the observation of Niese, "has no foundation

XIV. Again some writers e.g. Sir Mortimer Wheeler, who cannot bear the very idea of Indians being able to originate anything have tried to show that the Harappan Civilization was younger than and inspired by, if not derived from, that of the Sumerians, and to establish his point arbitrarily fixed 2,500-[58] for

---

except the anecdote that Candragupta paid honour to the alters set up by Alexander at the Hyphasis. The fact that Seleukos retired from India, giving up valuable provinces in exchange for only 500 elephants out of the 9,000 possessed by Chandragupta, that he entered into a matrimonial alliance, and sent an ambassador, clearly indicates the real nature of the relations between the sovereigns. Megasthnese exhibits the greatest respect for the Indian monarch, and never presumed to regard himself as the Resident at the court of a feudatory." Also see *A History and Culture of Indian People* (*The Age of Imperial Unity*) 1953, vol. II, p. 60, where, after a full examination of the available evidence, it is stated that "there is no warrant for the statement that a daughter of Greek Ruler was married to Chandragupta Maurya."

[58] Ancient India, No. 3, 1947, pp. 78-83; *Early India and Pakistan*, 1959, p. 94; Dawan of Civilization (Ed. S. Piggott), 1961, p. 243; *Statesman*, *New Delhi* March 19, 1965, Wheeler has been constrained to admit that there are 40 feet of unexplored structural strata, at Harappa and Mohenjodaro and his earlier estimate of the antiquity of the Indus Civilization was too low. Further he was forced to admit also, (*Antiquity*, Vol. XXVI, 1952, p. 186), "There is more resemblance between a Mesopotamian zigguret of the 25th century B.C. and a Mexican temple-pyramid of the 15th century A.D. than between the

the beginning of the Harappan civilization. To arrive at this result he ignored all other evidence, which is adverse to his hypothesis. For example neither he nor any other archaelogist has ever tried to rebut the argument of K.N. Sastri, that the relative stratigraphy of the mounds AB and F at Harappa, show that if the former is to be dated to the middle of the third millennium B.C., the latter shows that the Harappan civilization was already mature in the first half the fourth millennium B.C.[59] F.A. Durrani, also now advocates a high date.[60]

XV. *INDIAN MATHEMATICS*

G.R. Kaye also was one of those who could not bear the idea of Indians being capable of original thinking, and tried to disprove the universally acknowledged fact that the so-called Arabic numerals and the concept of zero were Indian in origin, as admitted by the Arab writers. To substantiate his view that all Indian science was borrowed from Greece, Kaye went so far as to postulate

---

former and the contemporary citadels and monuments of the Indus valley."

[59] New Light on *The Indus Civilization*, vol. I, 1957, pp. 66-72 ff; vol. II, 1965, p. 91 where Sastri observes, "For parallelisms between the Indus, the Sumerian and the Elamite civilizations we have to go back to the fourth millennium B.C. The middle of the third milliennium B.C. offers nothing by way of analogies." To the best of my knowledge no archaeologist has met the arguments of Sastri in dating the Indus Civ. to the first half of the 4th millennium B.C. In fact they avoid mentioning his name even.

[60] F.A. Durrani, *Bulletin of Univ. of Peshawar, Dept. of Arch.* vol. II, 1965-66, pp. 238 (review of Wheeler's *Ancient Pakistan*). He shows that the Indus civ. lasted longer and started much earlier than was first indicated by Wheeler, and that it had trade links with Mesopotamia, already in the first half of the IIIrd millennium B.C.; and that all this is confirmed by the borings made by George F. Dales, in 1965 and again in 1966. Also see present writers paper, 'Antiquity of the Indus Civ.' in "*Sanskriti*" (Felicitation volumes presented to A.N. Jha, Lieut. Governor of Delhi, on 2.4.1969) vol. III, where it has been shown with additional arguments that K.N. Sastri's chronology is right, and that the

contents of Greek works, on science, which have been lost,[61] and endeavoured to prove that a large number of inscriptions showing the use of zero from 595 A.D.[62] onwards were forgeries[63]. Others tried to give the credit of the invention of zero to the Babylonians, the Arabs and even the pre-Columbian Americans of Ist century A.D.[64]. It has now been shown that all such attempts have failed[65], and none of these other peoples had any idea of the concept of zero, as elaborated in India[66] and which is one of the basic concepts of modern mathematics. Curiously the same Kaye has been forced to admit that Indians of the period of the Brahman literature, whose *terminus post quem* is 1,500 B.C. while in all probability its *terminus ante quem* is 2,500 B.C., had knowledge of the precession of equinoxes[67].

---

commencement of the First Dynasty of Egypt and the First Dynasty at Kish, after the flood, should be dated to 3600 B.C., and that the chronologies of the period between the end of Al'Ubaid and the beginning of Sargonic period in 2400 B.C. as given by Assyriologists is pure guess work.

[61] *Scientia*, vol. XXV, 1919, pp. 1-14.

[62] *Hist. of Hindu Mathematics* (by B.B. Dutta and A.N. Singh) Hindi Tran. by K.S. Shukla, 1956, Pt. I, pp. 36-40.

[63] *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, New Series, vol. III, 1907, pp. 482-487.

[64] Svend Aage Pallis, *Antiquity of Iraq*, 1956, p. 740. He is not a competent authority on mathematics, and his view has been more than refuted by competent Assyriologists cum mathematicians like A. Labat (see footnote No. 65.)

[65] *Ancient and Medieval Science* (Ed. Rene Thaton, Eng. Trs. 1963). R. Labat, shows on page 90-91, that the Babylonian claim is unjustified; similarly G. Strasser, shows on page 380, that the Mayan claim also is not sustainable.

[66] *Hist. of Hindu Mathematics* (see No. 62) pp. 54-47, 80-81; Kamalaśīla, commentator of *Tattvasaṅgraha* of Śāntrakṣita, dated to 1st century A.D., *ślokas* 1787-1790, for knowledge of 'zero'; also *Piṅgala's Chandaḥsūtra* dated 200 B.C. was aware of 'zero'.

[67] G.R. Kaye, "Nakshatras and precession", *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 50, 1921, pp. 48.

XVI. *ARTHAŚĀSTRA OF KAUṬILYA*

Similarly an indirect attempt has been made to belittle India, by throwing doubts on the authenticity and date of the famous *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, by W. Winternitz[68], O. Stein[69], J. Jolly[70], A.B. Keith, supported by K. Nag, Prannath, V.I. Kalyanov[74], K.C. Ojha[75], and many others. The arguments of all these have been more than fully answered by eminent scholars like, R. Shamasastri[76], H. Jacobi[77], D.R. Bhandarkar[78], B. Breloer[79], K.P. Jayaswal[80], N.N. Law[81], P.V. Kane[82], K.A. Nilakanta

---

[68] *Sir Asutosh Memorial Vol.* Part I, 1926-28, pp, 25. 48; *Calcutta Review*, April, 1924.

[69] *Arthaśāstra* and *Śilpaśāstra AOr,* VII (1935). pp. 73-487. *AOr* VIII, 1936, pp. 69-90. 334-356, *AOr,* Vol. X. pp. 163-209; *Ind. Hist. Qtrly,* Vol. IV, 1928, 778-782.

[70] *ZDMG,* Vol. 67, 1913, pp. 49-96; *Ibid.,* vol. 68, 1914, pp. 345-359, vol. 69, 1915, pp. 369-78 and other publications and papers, also, *Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya,* by J. Jolly & R. 2 vols., Lahore 1923-24.

[71] *Jour. of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 1916, pp. 130-137, *Sir Asutosh Memorial Vol.* 1926-28, Part I, p. 8-22.

[72] *Les Theories diplomatiques de l'Inde ancienne et l'Arthaçāstra,* Paris, 1923.

[73] *Indian Antiquary,* Vol. 60, 1931, pp. 109-122, 121-123.

[74] *International Cong. of Orientalists,* XXIIIrd Sess., Moscow, 1954, pp. 40-54.

[75] *Indian Historical Quarterly,* Vol. XXVIII, 1952, pp. 265-272.

[76] *Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya,* 1960, 1951, pp. xxv-xxxiii.

[77] *Indian Antiquary,* vol. 47, pp., 157-161, 187-195, and other papers in German.

[78] *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute,* Vol. VII, 1926, pp. 65-84.

[79] *ZII,* Vol. VII, 1929, pp. 205-232; and other works in German.

[80] *Indian Antiquary,* vol. 47, 1918, pp. 50-56.

[81] *Calcutta Review,* 1924 (Sep., Nov. and Dec.); *Studies in Indian Hist. & Culture,* 1925, pp. 209-266; *Indian Hist. Qtly.,* Vol. II, 1926, pp. 385, 407, 683.

[82] *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Inst.,* Vol. VII, 1926, pp. 85-100.

Sastri[83], Ganapati Sastri[84], A.P. Bannerji Sastri[85], V.R. Ramchandra Dikshitar[86], J.J. Meyer[87], Jayachandra Narang Vidyalankar[88], R.P. Kangle[89]. Many of the arguments urged against the view that Kauṭilya wrote his work, and centre around the preconceived notion of the former set of scholars, that India could not have been so advanced in the 4th century B.C. as can be definitely asserted on the basis of the *Arthaśāstra*. The hollowness of such a prejudiced and subjective view is well illustrated by Winternitz, who declared that Kauṭilya was a 'Pandit' not a statesman[90] and also that the existence of highly developed technical literature was not probable in India of the 4th century B.C.! Afterall Gladstone was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and yet had a profound knowledge of Greek and Latin literature and was also an adept at Christian theology, though he suffered the greatest intellectual defeat of his life at the hands of the illustrious Thomas Henry Huxley[91] and he also received a severe drubbing from Lord Macaulay[92].

XVII. The dating of the great Pāṇini also has been a field of play for these scholars Max Müller, Weber, Macdonell, Keith, etc. who did not date him earlier than the 4th century B.C. Again they change their views, without assigning any reasons; for example, A.A. Macdonell, first dated him to 4th century B.C.[93] and later on assigned him to the 5th century B.C.[94] In neither case did he cite any evidence. The vast majority of Indian and a few western scholars, like Sir R.G. Bhandarkar[95], Theodore Goldstucker[96], Pathak[97], Rajwade[98], C.V. Vaidya[99], Vincent Smith[100], S.P. Chaturvedi[101], Ram Gopal[102] and many others assign him on very strong grounds to 850-700 B.C. Perhaps a mean date of 750-700 B.C. appears me to be provisionally accepted.

---

[83] *Ibid.*, vol. XXVIII, 1947, pp. 84-95.

[84] *Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya*, Part I & II, 1924 & Part III, 1925.

[85] *Jour of Bihar & Orissa Research Society*, Vol, XI, 1925.

[86] *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Inst.* Vol. XIII, 1931-32, pp. 326-330.

[87] *ZII*, vol. VII, 1929, pp. 194-204.

[88] *Bhāratīya Itihāsa Ki Rūparekhā*, 1923, pp. 672-701.

[89] *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra (A Study)*, Part III, 1965, pp. 59-115.

[90] *Calcutta Review*, 1924 (April), pp. 16-17.

[91] *Hist. of Eng. Rationalism in the Nineteenth Cent.*, Vol. II, 1906, pp. 454-455.

[92] Lord Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays*, vol. II, (Everyman's series, No. 226), pp. 237-289 (A Review of Gladstone's "*The State in its Relations with the Church*, IInd Ed., 1839, London).

Again W.D. Whitney, after comparing the rules laid down by Pāṇini, with the facts of the Vedic texts, had pronounced the former to be inadequate and also declared that there were 1000-1200 false roots in the *Dhātupāṭha*. S.S. Bhawe[103] and

---

[93] A.A. Macdonell, *A History of Sanskrit Literature* (1958 ed.) p. 17.

[94] A.A. Macdonell, *India's Past*, p. 58.

[95] Sir R.G. Bhandarkar, *Collected Works*, 1929, Vol. IV, p. 589.

[96] Theodor Goldstucker, *Pāṇini and His Place in Sansk. Lit.*, pp. 228-238; *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. I, 299-302, Vol. II, pp. 57, 69, 94, 206-10, 238, 362, Vol. xv. pp. 80-84, XVI, 156, 172.

[97] K.B. Pathak, *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Institute*, (ABORI), vol. XI p. 83.

[98] V.K. Rajwade, read a paper in the *Itihasa Samsodhaka Mandala*, Poona, in 1911, See *Report*.

[99] C.V. Vaidya, *Hist. of Sanskrit Literature*, 1930, Pt. III, pp. 146-160, accepts all the arguments of Rajwade.

[100] Vincent Arthur Smith,, *Oxford History of India*, Ed. 1923, p. 57 footnote.

[101] S.P. Chaturvedi, *Woolner Comm.* Vol. 1940,00 46-50; *Sidheswhar Varma Comm. Volume*, II, 1950, pp. 144-147. He criticised Keith, (*R.K. Mookerjee Commemoration Volume*, Vol. I, pp. 345 ff), who insisted on 350 B. C. for Pāṇini.

[102] *India of the Kalpasutras*, pp. 86-87 assigns Pāṇini to 7th Cent. B.C. and refutes V.S. Agarwala who dated him to 5th century B.C.

[103] S.S. Bhawe, *All India Oriental Conference* (Proceedings), Ahmedabad 17th ession, 1953, pp. 231-240 and *Suniti Kumar Chatterji Commemoration Volume*, 1955, spp. 237-249.

Bühler[101] have shown conclusively that Whitney was very wide of the mark. Here again the attempt of these scholars has been to discredit India, by throwing doubt on the competence of the greatest grammarian that has ever lived.

XVIII. About ten years ago a controversy arose between Sir Leonard Woolley and Dr. R.C. Majumdar (The former is a joint author with Jacquetta Hawkes, of Volume I, *History of Mankind*, and he deals with "The Beginnings of Civilization" in Part II of the volume). He had never been to India, except on two very brief flying visits, before and during the World War II and did not know any Indian language or anything about India. His guides have been Professor Stuart Piggott and Sir Mortimer Wheeler, and neither of these two knew a word of any of the Indian languages, to say nothing of Vedic or Classical Sanskrit. Sir Leonard subscribes to the theory put forward by Mortimer Wheeler that the Aryans destroyed the Harappan civilization, and remarks:[105]

> "One wave of 'Aryan invasion' in time broke through the northern barrier of Baluchistan into India; there they found still existing (this is generally assumed to have been round about 1500 B.C.) the great cities of the Indus valley whose merchants had up till now maintained their touch with Mesopotamia, and they overwhelmed them. The Rigveda is the epic of the destruction of one of the great cultures of the ancient world."

---

[101] G. Bühler, *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXIII, 1894, pp. 141-154 and 250-255 has shown the hollowness of this charge.

[105] Sir Leonard Woolley, *History of Mankind*, Vol. I (Unesco), Part II, p. 389 and the discussion with R.C. Majumdar, referred to on pp. 405-407. Also see Woolley's view for which also he has offered no evidence, on pp. 458 and 465, that the gateway of the famous *Baudha Stūpa* at Sanchi was constructed under the inspiration of the wooden architecture of China ! His view was contested by Prof. Ilys, but Woolley did not yield.

Full details of the controversy were related by Majumdar in an address before the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Poona, on the occasion of the 34th anniversary of the late Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, on Risi-Panchami, 7th September, 1959, and published in vol. XL, pages 1-15, of the *Annals* of the Institute. In the course of discussion, mostly, it seems, by correspondence, Sir Leonard Woolley shifted his ground, but stuck to his thesis. The matter was referred to the General Editor, who was equally ignorant of the subject! But he sided with Sir Leonard Woolley, and the readers of the first volume, already referred to, will naturally conclude, that Woolley was right! Thus deliberate, mischievous and malicious anti-Indian propaganda is issuing from the very headquarters of the United Nations!

XIX. *Vikrama Era*: The origin of this era also remains an unsolved mystery, though it appears that many scholars have begun to believe that even though there is no contemporary inscriptional evidence for the existence of Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, in the first century B.C., the evidence of Jain texts cannot be ignored, and there is a probability of his being a ruler of flesh and blood[106]. But to what absurd lengths even profound scholars went to account for the origin of this era, is illustrated by the attempts of Dr. James Fergusson, who considered that on the morrow of the great National Deliverance from the thraldom of the Huṇas, when the armies of King Harsha of Ujjayini, inflicted

---

[106] R.C. Majumdar, *The History and Culture of Indian People*, (*The Classical Age*) vol. III, 1954, p. 302, where he dated Kālidāsa between 100 B.C. and 450 A.D. How ridiculous the situation can be is well shown by this. Majumdar found, that Prof. M.A. Mehendale, did not allude to Kālidāsa, in *Vol. II of the History* (ch. on Language and lit.) as he believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the Gupta age, while Prof. G.V. Devasthali, who contributed the chapter on Sanskrit, *in Vol. III of the History*, believing in the Ist century B.C. theory, also did not mention Kālidāsa ! Kālidāsa would have been left out from the great History, if Majumdar had not intervened (vide *Vol. II, Preface*, p. 1)

Ganesh Varni Digambar Jain Institute, Narià, Varanasi

a crushing and decisive defeat on the Huna forces of Mihirkula in 544 A.D. at the great battle of Korur, the Vikrama era was instituted to commemorate this heroic deed but was ante-dated back to the first century B.C.[107]. This solution of the puzzle was welcome to Max Müller as it lent support to his hypothesis of Renaissance in Sanskrit Literature in the 6th century A.D., since he dated Kālidāsa also to the sixth century A.D.! It is remarkable, that inspite of complete refutation of the 6th century date for Kālidāsa, by scholars like A.A. Macdonell, and others; even so sane a savant, as Prof. A.W. Ryder, was led into accepting Max Müller's theory of Sanskrit Literature in the 6th century A.D.[108].

XX. *ORIGIN OF THE BRĀHMĪ SCRIPT*

The speculation of the last two centuries or so, about the origin of this national script of India, well illustrate the mental reservations and prejudices of most of the Western scholars, in favour of deriving everything from outside India. Unfortunately this script comes to notice when it is fully developed, and previous evolutionary stages are absent. All scholars are now agreed that it was the one script in the world which was invented not by traders but by specialists in phonology and grammar, as it has the most scientifically designed alphabet[109]. Some scholars derived it, as usual, from Greece[110], others gave the credit to Western Asia[111], and a third set of scholars has advanced the arguments for its indigenous origin[112]. But the majority of Western scholars

---

[107] Quoted by Saradaranjan Ray, *Abhijñāna-Śākuntalam*, 1924, pp. 1-2.

[108] *Kālidāsa, Translations of Śakuntalā and other Works*, Everyman Series, No. 629, Introduction, p. vii. It seems that at present the scholarly opinion is more or less evenly divided between the upholders of the Gupta Age theory for Kālidāsa and the advocates of the traditional date in the First cent. B.C.; But Sardaranjan Ray, *Op. cit.*, 29 and Prof. Shembavanekar (*Jour. of the Univ. of Bombay*, 1,4, pp. 232-242 assign him to 2nd Cent. B.C. contemporary with Agnimitra Śunga. The theory of renaissance in Sanskrit Literature in the VIth Cent. A.D. propounded by Max Müller was later on completely demolished by G. Bühler.

---

[109] G. Bühler, *Indian Paleography*, Reprinted, *Indian Studies Past and Present*, Vol. I, Pt. I, Oct., 1959, pp. 33-34., admitted, "Nevertheless, the oldest known form of the Brāhmi, without a doubt, was a script framed by learned Brāhmans for writing Sanskrit...... The hand of the phonologist and grammarian is recognisable in the following points...... All this has so learned an appearance and is so artificial that it could only have been invented by Pandits, not by traders and clerks." A.A. Macdonell, in his *History of Sanskrit Lit.* (1958 ed.) p. 17 observes, "This complex alphabet which was evidently worked out by learned Brahmans, must have existed by 500 B.C. This is the alphabet which is recognised in Pāṇini's great Sanskrit grammar of abouy 4th century B.C. (in his *India's Past*, p. 58, he dates Pāṇini to 500 B.C.) ...... We Europeans on the other hand, 2500 year later, and in a scientific age, still employ an alphabet, which is not only inadequate to represent all the sounds of our languages, but even preserves the random order in which vowels and consonants are jumbled up as they were in the Greek adapatation of the primitive Semitic arrangement of 3000 years ago."

[110] Among the advocates of Greek origin theory, Diringer has named, in his *Alphabet*, p. 335, Otfried Mueller, James Princep, Emile Senart (*Indian Antiquary*, vol. XXXV, p. 253), Goblet d'Alviella (*Jour. Asiatique*, 1888, p. 268), Joseph Halevy, H.H. Wilson (*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXV, p. 253).

[111] The derivation from Phoenician, has been advocated by R.N. Cust, *Jour. of Royal Asiatic Soc.* Vol. 16, 1884, pp. 325-359; Sir William Jones (see *Ind. Ant.* Vol. 35, p. 253); A. Weber, *Indische Skizzen*, pp. 225-250; Theodor Benfey (Ind. Ant. Vol. 35, p. 253); Max Muller, (*Op. cit.*); F. Miller (*Op. cit.*), A.H. Sayce *(Op. cit.)*, W.D. Whitney (*Op. cit.*) accepted Weber's views with some hesitation; Stevenson, *Jour. of Bombay Br. of Royal Asiatic Soc.* vol. III, p. 9); P. Goldsmith (Burnell's *South Indian Paleography*, p. 9) was of opinion that the Singhalese script was derived from Phoenician, and the Brāhmi was derived, then, from the former.); Burnell himself (Muller, *Report on Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon*, p. 9) held that Brāhmi was derived from Aramaic, which was itself derived from Phoenician, but Issac Taylor (*Alphabet*, Vol. II, p. 313) denied this derivation, F. Leonarmant was also an advocate of Phoenician. Edward Claude (*Story of the Alphabet*, p. 207) derived Sabian from Phoenician and Brāhmi from the former. Issac Taylor himself was an advocate of deriving Brāhmi from Southern Semitic. But the most powerful advocate of West Asiatic origin of Brāhmi was

---

G. Buhler (*Indian Paleography*) pp. 9-11). Dr. David Diringer, *Alphabet*, is one of the latest advocates of the theory of Buhler. Buhler's theory was adversely criticised by P. Giles, (*Encyclopaedea Brittanica*, XIth Ed., Vol. I, 1922 (reprint of Xth ed. with supple. volumes) pp. 723-732; and T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India* (Story of Nations Series, 102) p. 114. Dr. J.F. Fleet was also sceptical about Buhler's theory; but Rapson, and Barnett support Buhler.

[112] Among those who have advanced arguments in favour of Indegenous origin of Brāhmi, may be mentioned, Edward Thomas, Numismatic Chronicle, No. II, 1883; Dowson *Jour of Royal Asiatic Soc.* 1881, p. 102; *Ind. Ant.* Vol. xxxv p. 253. Sir Alexander Cunningham, *Coins of Ancient India*, Vol. I, p. 52; Christian Lassen, *Indische* Alterthumskunde, IInd ed., 1867, p. 1006. In the last 40 years S. Langdon, *Mohenjodaro and Indus Civilization*, Vol. II, 1931, edited by Sir John Marshall, pp. 431-32 and 454-455, is the only western Indologist who has advocated Indian origin of Brāhmi. Among great Indian scholars, who have advanced substantial arguments for the indegenous origin of Brāhmi, see D.R. Bhandarkar, "On the origin of the Indian Brāhmi Alphabet," *First Oriental Conference*, Poona, 1919, pp. 305-318. But the scholars who has advanced the really irrefutable arguments, to which neither Buhler nor anyone else after him has been able to give any reply (about which more later on), is Mahāmahopādhyaya, Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha of Ajmer (Bhāratīya Prāchina Lipimālā, IIIrd ed., 1959, pp. 17-31).

In support of West Asiatic origin was cited the evidence of the Erana coin, a few letters in Asokan inscriptions and the Yerragudi inscrip. of Aśoka. Hultzsch and J.F. Fleet, showed that these were the mistakes of the engravers and (See Fleet's remarks on Buhler's *Ind. Paleography*, (reprinted in *Indian Studies Past and Present*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1959, p. 10-13). Thus no proof has been furnished for Brāhmi ever being written from right to left. It should also be noted that when the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phoenicians, the names they gave to their own modification of the same, betray, the origin, e.g.

Phoenician	*Greek*
alep	alpha
bet	beta
gimel	gamma
dālet	delta
wāw	vau (digamma)

advocate the West Asiatic theory of Bühler; and among its latest supporters are David Diringer[113] and A.H. Dani[114]. It seems that at the most only seven pre-Aśokan inscriptions have so far been discovered, and many scholars do not accept that they are pre-Mauryan[115].

---

zayin	zēta
het	hēta
ṭet	thēta.

etc. But there is no such correspondence between the Brāhmī and any of the Western Asiatic letters. But in spite of everything so great is the prejudice against any concept of Indian origin of Brāhmi, that it is stated, "It reached India and had a significant influence on the creation there, by 300 B.C., of an Aryan alphabet" (vide, *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Archaeology*, edited by Leonard Cottrell, 1960, p. 74).

Theodor Goldstucker, *Pāṇini*, Allahabad, 1914, pp. 12-47, supports Indian origin and points out that written accounts were necessary for Pāṇini's terminology and hence for Vedic Literature.

[115] Ojha, *Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā*, pp. 2-3; also see, Eran Coin Legend (Cunningham, *Ancient Coins of India*, p. 101) is dated to a period earlier than the 4th century B.C. (Bühler, *Ind. Paleography*, p. 8); (II) Taxila Coin legend; on paleographic and numismatic grounds dated to 4th century B.C. (Cunningham, *Op. cit.*); (III) Mahāsthān stone plaque inscription, found in Bogra Dist. of Bengal (old United - now in Pakistan), *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XXI, p. 85 and *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1934, p. 5 ff; (IV) Piprahwa Buddhist vase inscription, *Jour of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1898, p. 387 ff; (V) Bhattiprolu relic-casket Dravidi inscription, assigned to pre-Aśokan period, on the grounds of liquidity of some of its characters e.g. 'da' 'bha', archaic nature of some letters e.g. 'cha', 'ja' 'sa' and also independent forms of 'la' and 'la'. (vide Bühler, *Indische Paleographie*, Plate II. Cols. XIII-XIV); (VI) Sohagura copper plate inscription, from Gorakhpur district, (vide *Indian Hist. Quarterly*, vol. X, p. 54 ff); (VII) Badli inscription, discovered in Ajmer district now in the local museum; bears inscription "*Virāya Bhagavate chatusite vase*" (i.e. dedicated to Lord (Mahā)Vīra in his 84th year). Majority of scholars accept either 486 B.C. or 544 B.C. as the date of Buddha Nirvāṇa for the same event. In view of the fact that the former is based on the dotted record at Canton, several thousand miles away, and also knowledge of Buddhism reached China much later than it reached Ceylon, I am more disposed to accept the date to be 544 B.C. It should also be remem-

XXI. Several scholars expressed grave doubts about the inadequacy of Bühler's theory and M.M. Gourishankar Ojha joined issue with him. The latter had sent to the former a copy of his own *Prāchina Bhāratīya Lipimālā*[116] (1894). Bühler had objected that Ojha was wrong in advocating indigenous origin of Brāhmī[117]. Ojha replied back that if Brāhmī was derived during the period 1000-800 B.C. and the Khāroshṭhī was also derived from the same source a couple hundred years later, how is it, that within about seven centuries not the slightest similarity was left between the two scripts. Buhler did not reply to this objection and so far nobody else has[118]. Ojha has demonstrated very graphically, how by the application of the principles enunciated by Bühler, almost any script could be derived from another and as an example showed how ancient Brāhmī could be derived from modern English[119]. D.R. Bhandarkar has also stated that in 1905, a very intelligent and young Bengali scholar performed a similar feat[120].

XXII. Diringer has advanced some arguments in favour of Bühler's theory and they may be dealt with at this stage. He urges

---

bered that K.P. Jayaswal has brought wonderful harmony in Saiśunāga chronology, in which also the date of Buddha Nirvāṇa comes to 544 B.C. *Journal of Bihar & Orissa Research Society*, vol. I, 1915, pp. 69-116). This date is independently confirmed by the astronomical calculation of the solar eclipse recorded in *Samyukta Nikāya* (P.C. Sen-Gupta, *Ancient Indian Chronology*, 1947, pp. 217-221). Thus the Badli inscription can be dated easily, as Mahāvīra died at the age of 70 years, eight years before Buddha. Thus the date of the record would be 544+70+8=538 B.C.

[116] Ojha, *Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā*, 3rd ed., 1959, pp. footnote no. 1.

[117] *Ibid*

[118] *Ibid*

[119] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-26.

[120] Origin of Indian Alphabet, *First Oriental Conference*, Poona, 1919, p. 318.

[121] *Alphabet*, pp. 328-334, 335, 336 and 337.

that:

(a) The existence of two or more successive scripts in the same country does not necessarily prove that one is derived from the other, e.g., Greek alphabet is not derived from the Linear B of Crete; (b) until it can be established that the phonetic values of the Indus script as those of the Brāhmi, it cannot be held that the later is derived from the former; (c) the Indus script is syllabic, while Brāhmi is semi-alphabetic, and there is no example of the former type becoming an alphabetic script; (d) there is no indication in Vedic literature that the Aryans knew writing and the Aryan pantheon does not have god of writing even though they had Saraswati as goddess of learning; (e) only Buddhist literature gives clear references to the art of writing; (f) epigraphic evidence shows that Brāhmi was in existence in the 6th century B.C.; (g) due to commerce between India and western Asia in the 8th-6th century B.C., there were great advances in India also and Indian merchants derived knowledge of writing from the Semites; (h) the advent of Aryans in India is to be dated to 15th century B.C.; (i) there was profound intellectual and moral revolution in India in the 6th century B.C. due to rise of Buddhism and Jainism and just as knowledge of writing assisted in the spread of the two systems, they in their turn assisted in spreading the knowledge of writing; (j) Indian alphabet is in no respect an independent creation, though marvellous skill was shown in adopting to Indian requirements the borrowed elements; (k) the idea of representing vowels and consonantal sounds by symbols of a pure alphabetic character was derived from Western Asia and the Indian characters are semi-alphabetic; (l) Brāhmi is not a derivative from the Aramaic; only the idea of writing was accepted, even though many Brāhmi signs show Semitic influence; and as Brāhmi was written, initially, from right to left, indicates Semitic influence; (m) it is wrong to hold that semi-alphabetic Brāhmi could be derived from the fully alphabetic Phoenician or

Aramaic. The advocates of this idea seem to forget that Semitic alphabets did not have vowels, and while Semitic languages could do without them the Indo-European languages could not emulate them. The Indians were less successful in their effort to develop an alphabet than the Greeks.

These arguments of Diringer are not half so formidable as look at first sight.

(a) Diringer has omitted to mention that in Crete, the first script was pictographic; and Linear A was derived from it, and Linear B was in its turn derived from the latter[122]. Sir Alan Gardiner, has shown that the Egyptians had evolved an alphabet of 24 characters from their Heiroglyphic signs. Flinders Petrie also found these signs in the inscriptions in Sinai penninusla. These latter signs numbered only 30 and hence were alphabetic. At least six of them could be shown to correspond to Hebrew and Greek characters[123]. Moreover if the view of Diringer that alphabets cannot be developed out of pictographic scripts be conceded, the mystery of the origin of alphabet will never be solved.

(b) No one has yet proved or disproved that the phonetic values of the Indus script are not the same as those of Brāhmi.

(c) already disposed of under (a) above.

(d) shows complete ignorance of Vedic literature. Bühler also accepted that there were written texts in Vedic literature[124]. Full references proving existence of writing in Vedic period have been given by Ojha[125]. While poetry in one metre throughout can be composed orally and also transitted orally, the illiterate singers of folk songs, have no conception of metres and there are numerous and complicated metres in Vedic poetry. Besides, prose literature cannot be composed or transmitted orally; socially if the bulk is so great as that of the Vedic literature. Rudolf Roth has pointed out that the 'Pratiśākhyas' could not have been composed orally[126]. The reason why the Veda was taught orally was to ensure that no words were pronounced incorrectly. Besides grammatical studies, which in respect of Sanskrit began in the Brāhmaṇa period, several countries before Pāṇini, could not have been carried out on the vast scale indicated (Yāska, who is earlier than Pāṇini, the date of Pāṇini cannot be brought down later than 500 B.C., and the most probable period is 750-700 B.C. cites 18 grammarians before himself)[127]. Further, in India, Goddess of Learning has always been Goddess of writing as the two were never differentiated. Moreover Brahmā is always shown with the Vedas, in bookform, in his hands. There is an image in Lucknow Museum of Saraswati, dating to the Ist Cent. A.D. showing her with a book in her hands (See *Guide to Lucknow Museum*, by V.S. Agrawala).

---

[122] J. Chadwick, *Decipherment of Linear B*, (Pelican), 1961, pp. 12-13.

[123] *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 1961, pp. 23-26· Also another instance, provided by the Behistun Rock inscriptions of the Achaemenid Emperor, Darius I, about which it is stated in the *Encyclopaedea of Archaeology*, 1960 (edited by Leonard Cottrell), p. 112, "Babylonian cuneiform is an extremely complex script, with a great number of different signs none of which is really alphabetic, whereas Persian cuneiform, though derived from the Babylonian is considerably simplified, alphabetic, and has only forty-three signs.

[124] *Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā*, 1959, pp. 6-12.

(e) Buddhist literature never claimed that writing was invented by a Buddhist or Buddha. In fact they all either imply or expressly state that Buddha himself learnt various kinds of scripts.

(f) The paucity of pre-Aśokan inscriptions on imperishable material like stone, is easily explained as the barks of trees and shrubs were mostly used for the purpose and Indian monarchs were not so so vainglorious as an Entemmena or a Sharrukin and did not attach too much value to earthly glory. Moreover the

---

[125] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-16.

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[127] *Ibid.* p. 8.

Vedic people did not construct temples and hence could adorn their walls with inscriptions; nor did they construct tombs, Long inscriptions have not yet been found in the Harappan remains, but everybody is convinced that there must have been much more copious records on perishable material, which have all been irretrievably lost. Perhaps the use of stone for recording monumental inscriptions began in India only in about the 6th century B.C.

(g) What is the evidence that Indian traders brought writing back to India, from western Asia in the 8th century B.C.? Besides it has been admitted even by Buhler and Macdonell and their knowledge of Vedic and classical Sanskrit was much greater than that of Diringer, who probably does not know one word of them, that Brāhmi was not the creation of traders or clerks and only great thinkers and grammarians could have devised such a script. How does Diringer know that the concept of writing was not derived by these 'Pandits' from the traditions of the Harappan writings? There is also the view of archaeologists like Fairservis[128] who maintain that the Harappan civilization survived till 1200 B.C. If this be correct there was an overlap and the 'Pandits' could have acquired the concept during that time, even if the dates assigned to the Veda, by western scholars, be accepted.

(h) The idea that the Aryans came to India in the 15th century B.C. is an hypothesis only; neither Diringer nor any other scholar of that view has ever offered an iota of proof. Hence mere assertion, however, forcibly expressed, has no value.

(i) Even if there is considerable truth in the statement that a profound revolution took place due to rise of Buddhism and Jainism, the process had started much earlier in the days of the Upaniṣads.

---

[128] *Man*, Vol. 56, Art. 173, "Chronology of the Harappan civilization and the Aryan invasions."

(j) Again this is a mere assertion of personal opinion without any evidence to support it.

(k) First part of the argument is again a mere opinion without any basis. The second part may or may not be true, but it has been admitted by all scholars, that Greek alphabet does not show scientific systematic ordering and grouping of signs according to their sounds, while Brāhmi does. How does Diringer solve this connundrum. Why did the Greeks fail here and Indians succeed ?

(l) First part smacks very like the idea of Mortimer Wheeler, that the Harappans got the idea of civilization and writing from the Sumerians and without further ado, created overnight a civilization, superior, in most respects, to the contemporary civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia. The second part has been completely disproved; Brāhmī was never written from right to left.

(m) If the contention be granted, how does he explain that Greek was written in Linear B? Or how was the Indo-European Hittite or Mitanni, written in the Cuneiform characters of the Babylonians? What is the proof the Indus script does not have vowels.

(n) Ojha has pointed out that the maximum number of signs India could have borrowed would not have exceeded 22 for 18 sounds from Western Asia. This implies that the Indian phonologists and grammarians had to invent letters for about 40/42 sounds. If they were competent to invent 40/42 where was the necessity for them to borrow even 22; were they incompetent to do so? Their competence is admitted even by Diringer.

It will be clear from the foregoing that there is not a shred of evidence in favour of theories of foreign derivation of Brāhmī; on the contrary strong evidence exists in favour of the theory that

---

[129] MM. Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha, *Bhāratīya Prāchīna Lipimālā*, 1959, p. 29.

Brāhmī was derived from some pre-existing *lipi* (script), which may or may not have been Harappan. Some scholars would derive even the latter from Mesopotamia.

Another example of absurd lengths to which some of these writers go may be cited. Calvin Klephart in his book, *Sanskrit, its Origin, Composition and Diffusion*, published in Strassbourg, has propounded the thesis that the language of the Goths, subsequently modified became the classifical Sanskrit and was imposed on the Hindus of Western India, in 58 B.C. and that Vedic Sanskrit was brought to India in 1400 B.C. by the Gothic invaders (vide R.N. Dandekar, *Vedic Bibliography*, 1961, p. 209).

XXIII. One of the most determined and sustained efforts, ever since Indological studies began in Europe, has been to discredit ancient Indian astronomy. Among the most vehement denouncers were, A. Weber[130], W.D. Whitney[131], G. Thibaut[132], and H. Oldenberg[133]. They maintained, without a scintilla of evidence, that the Indo-Aryans were very poor at astronomical observations, did not correctly determine the length of the year, and finally that everything worthwhile in India astronomy was borrowed from the Greeks and the Arabs (these latter however themselves have admitted that they acquired a good deal of their astronomical knowledge from India!). One of the main onslaughts was on the origin of the Indian lunar zodiac of 27 nakṣatras.

---

[130] A. Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naxatra*, 1,2, ABA, 1860-1862, See also Max Muller's reply, in his *Text of the Ṛgveda*, Vol. IV, 182 pp. xxviii-lxxi.

[131] W.D. Whitney, *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 24, 1895, pp. 364-365; and QJMS, Vol. XII, p. 176.

[132] G. Thibaut, Astronomie, *Astrologie und Mathematik*, 1899, p. 12 ff. *Grundriss der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, cited by M. Winternitz, *Hist. of Ind. Lit.* Vol. I, p. 295.

[133] "Naksatra and Sicou", NGGW, 1909, b 544 ff. cited by Winternitz, *Hist. of Ind. Lit.* Vol. I, p. 295.

Weber started the theory of Babylonian origin[134] of this zodiac and was most vehemently supported by W.D. Whitney[135], mildly by Bühler[136], and again by A.B. Keith[137], and Lehmann Haupt[138]. None of these nor any one else has brought forward an iota of evidence, inspite of the fact that more than a 100 years have passed and no reference to a Lunar zodiac has been found in more than 500,000 inscribed cuneiform tablets that have been unearthed in Mesopotamia during this period[139]. In fact the Babylonian theory has been so completely refuted that but for its reiteration by some Western Indologists, it would hardly be worthwhile mentioning it. Another theory was started by Biot and supported by Hardwick[140] (even so competent a scholar as Christian Lessen[141] was misled into accepting it) to the effect that the Indian *nakṣatra* system was borrowed from China. This theory was also completely refuted by F. Max Müller[142] and B.V. Kameswara Aiyar[143], and again by Agnes Mary Clerke[144]. In fact it has been shown by Kameswara Aiyar[145] and N.N. Law[146] that the upholders of the theory of Babylonian and Chinese origin of the Indian *nakṣatra* system frequently did not understand the implications of their statements, and thus contradicted themselves and in many cases misunderstood the very texts which they were considering and showed themselves completely incompetent to comprehend them and yet they pronounced judgement[14]. This is one of those cases where truth has at last prevailed to such an extent that in India at least nobody now accepts foreign origin of the Indian Lunar zodiac. The upholders of the Babylonian origin theory have been loud in their praise of Babylonian astronomy. It is therefore, worthwhile to invite the attention of readers to the following:

---

[134] See 130 above.

[135] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 48, pp. 95-97 and the same, vol. 24, 1895, pp, 166. See also B.V. Kameswara Aayar, *Quarterly Jour. of Mythic Society* (QJMS) Vol XII, 1921-22, 176.

[136] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 23, 1894, p. 245, his review of Jacobi's Age of the Veda and Tilak's Orion.

[137] *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (JRAS), 1917, pp. 135-138 and jointly with A.A. Macdonell, *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 427 ff.

[138] *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* (ZDMG), Vol. 45, 1891, pp. 592 ff. cited by Keith, in *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 135-138.

[139] O. Neugebauer, *Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 1952, p. 29.

[140] *An Historical Inquiry into some of the chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World*, 1855-58, pp. 7-8.

[141] Christian Lassen, *Indian Antiquities*, p. 747.

[142] Preface to his *Text of the Ṛgveda*, 1862, Vol. IV, pp. xxviii-lxxi and *India What Can it Teach US.* 1862, pp. 126-133. He has made the unanswerable point that no Chinese dictionary is able to explain how in the Chinese Sieu (corresponding to the Indian nakshatras) the Sanskritic names 'Pausa', 'Māgha' and 'Phālguna' appear as 'Pehoua', 'Makue' and 'Pholkuna'. This clearly shows that it was the Chinese who borrowed from India, as otherwise Chinese terms would have crept in to the Indian System.

(a) Prof. Jastrow observes: "there is no evidence prior to B.C.

---

[144] *Encyclopaedea Briitanica*, XIth Ed. (1922), Vol. 28, pp. 993-997, Art. ZODIAC.

[145] *QJMS*, Vol. XII, 1921-22, pp. 177-193, 223-246 and 357-366. He shows that in criticising B.G. Tilak and H. Jacobi (their dating of the Vedic Literature), Thibaut missed some important passages, which entirely demolish the views of Thibaut and investigations based on passages relating to the naksatras on the one hand and those relating to Rtus, months, year, etc. unmistakeably point to 2300 B.C. as the date of commencement of the Brāhmaṇa literature.

[146] *Age of the Ṛgveda*, 1965 (Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya) 1965, pp. 1-160. Law (pp. 68-92; 114-138) shows how Tilak and Jacobi fulfil the four conditions laid down by W.D. Whitney, and how G. Thibaut has to contradict himself, in criticising them (*Ind. Ant.* 1894, pp. 95-100).

[147] *QJMS*, Vol. XII, pp. 173-174, 176, 178-182. Kameswara Aiyar shows conclusively that Professors A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith (*Vedic Index*, Art. Naksatra, JRAS, 1917, pp. 135-136,) and Rapson (*Ancient India*, p. 12) never understood or they ignored the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 1-5, 2 re: the division and revo. of the Deva and Yama nakṣatras or the Krittikā passage, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* II, 1-3) and the comments of Sāyaṇa and Bhatta Bhaskara, and yet pronounced judgement that the passages are a ritual absurdity and do not say anything about equinoxe (as if anyone ever claimed that they did mention equinoxes).

700 of more than a number of the constellations of our zodiac had become part of their current zodiac. The division of the ecliptic into twelve constellations does not appear to have been perfected until after the fall of the Babylonian Empire in 539 B.C. The golden age of Babylonian astronomy belongs not to the remote past as was until recently supposed but to the Selucid period, i.e. after the advents of the Greeks in the Euphrates valley. The defectiveness of early Babylonian astronomy may be gathered from the fact that as late as sixth century B.C., an error of almost an entire month was made by Babylonian astronomers in their attempt to determine through calculation the beginnings of a certain year[148]."

(b) With regard to the skill of the Babylonians in astronomy in whose praise scholars like Keith, Weber, Thibaut and Whitney, cried themselves hoarse, Neugebauer writes: "Thanks to the works of these scholars, it very soon became evident that mathematical theory played a major role in Babylonian astronomy as compared with the very modest role of observations, whose legendary accuracy more and more a myth. "Simultaneously the age of Babylonian astronomy had to be redefined. Early Mesopotamian astronomy appeared to be crude and merely qualitative, quite similar to contemporary Egyptian astronomy[149]."

XXIV. Even this is not the end of the story. For example Keith and other Western scholars maintain that the Vedic Aryans did not have solar reckoning, the Nakshatra ecliptic being connected with the moon only. Yet the very same Keith translates from the Yajurveda[150]:

---

[148] *Encyclopaedea Brittanica*, XIth Ed. 1922, Vol. II, p. 797.

[149] O. Neugebauer, *Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 1952, p. 92.

[150] *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* 4.4.11 The original passage runs:—

मधुश्च माधवश्च शुक्रश्च शुचिश्च नभश्च नभस्यश्चेषश्चोर्जश्च सहश्च सहस्यश्च तपश्च
तपस्यश्योपयामगृहीतोसि स सर्पोस्यं हस्पत्याय त्वा ॥

(a) (Ye are) Madhu and Mādhava, the months of Spring
(b) (Ye are) Śukra and Śuchi, the months of Summer
(c) (Ye are) Nabha and Nabhasya, the months of Rain
(d) (Ye are) Īśa and Ūrja, the months of Autumn
(e) (Ye are) Sahas and Sahasya, the months of Early Winter (i.e. Hemanta)
(f) (Ye are) Tapas and Tapasya, the months of cool season

It is an astronomical fact that the months which are connected with seasons can be nothing but solar. Ironically enough Keith admits that the Vedic Aryans practised intercalation[151]. Scholar

---

The same thing is found in *Taitt. Sam.* 1.4.14:
मधुश्च माधवश्च वासन्तिकावृत् शुक्रश्च शुचिश्च ग्रैष्मावृत् नभश्च नभस्यश्च वार्षिकावृत् इषश्चोर्जश्च शारदावृत् सहश्च सहस्यश्च हैमन्तिकावृत् तपश्च तपस्यश्च शैशिरावृत् ॥

[151] A. B. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads*, Vol. 1, p. 79. But Macdonell and Keith in their *Vedic Index*, 1912, Vol. 2, pp. 411-413 they seem to be doubtful and yet on page 162 they admit it !

[152] Among the scholars who have proved, beyond a shadow of doubt, that there was knowledge of Solar months, solar years and intercalation and they were employed may be mentioned P.C. Sen Gupta, on page 342 and of *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. III, he writes.

As given in the Brāhmaṇas			*Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*		
Lunar Months	*Solar Months*	*Season*	*Lunar Months*	*Solar Months*	*Season*
Phalgūna	Tapas	Winter	Māgha	Tapas	Winter
Chaitra	Tapasya		Phālguna	Tapasya	
Vaisākha	Madhu	Spring	Chaitra	Madhu	Spring
Jaistha	Mādhava		Vaisākha	Mādhava	
Ashāḍha	Śukra	Summer	Jyaisṭha	Śukra	Summer
Śrāvaṇa	Śuchi		Ashādha	Śuchi	
Bhādra	Nabhas	Rains	Srāvaṇa	Nabhas	Rains
	Nabhasya		Bhādrapada	Nabhasya	
Kārtika	Isha	Autumn	Asvna	Isha	Autumn
Agrahayaṇa	Urja		Kārttika	Urja	
Pauṣa	Sahas	Hemanta	Agrahayaṇa	Sahas	Hemanta
Māgha	Sahasya	or Dewy	Pauṣa	Sahasya	or Dewy
		Season			Season

after scholar in India has protested against Macdonell and Keith's denial of solar months[152], and yet the theory continues to be blindly accepted by Western scholars, and we in India are expected to accept the views of these gentlemen as Brahmavākya. But truth does triumph in the end; even G.R. Kaye, who had tried most to discredit Indian mathematics[153], has been forced to admit[154]:

> "The one point that is definite and has been ignored in the lengthy controversies that have taken place regarding the nakṣatras. It relates to the evidence that shows unmistakably that it was known that the constellations revolve with reference to the nakṣatras. This I take to indicate a knowledge of precession, a knowledge that has sometimes been denied, so far as the early Hindu teachers are concerned, and I suggest for your consideration that if the nakṣatra scheme was conceived as an ecliptic scale, analogus to the zodiac scale as used by modern astronomers, a number of controversial passages would be cleared up."

XXV. Why is it that a majority of these Western Indologists have adopted this attitude. Apart from political and theological

---

It will be noticed that the first solar month and the first lunar months, in the Brāhmanas are named 'Tapas' and 'Phālguna' respectively; while in the days of the *Vedānga Jyotiṣa,* they are 'Tapas' and 'Māgha'. *(Yajusha Jyotiṣa,* 6) The reason behind this shift was the precession of the Solstices or equinoxes by a period of 1700 years from 3100 to 1400 B.C. The Lunar month names are not found in the Samhitās, and it is suggested that the change over took place in about 2000 B.C. (Gorakh Prasad, *Bhāratiya Jyotiṣa ka Itihāsa,* Hindi, 1956, p. 28 *Report of the Indian Calendar Committee,* 1955, p. 218; S.B. Dixit, Bharatiya Jyotiṣa, Hindi Trs. 1957, pp. 40-41. *Vājas. Samhitā* also mentions Madhu, Mādhava etc. (18, 25; 14,6, 15, 16, 27 and 15, 57; 7, 30; 22, 30; 22, 311).

[153] *Scientia* Vol. XXV, pp. 1-14.

[154] *Indian Antiquary,* Vol. 50, 1950, pp. 44-48.

considerations, two of the main reasons, for trying to discredit India and Indians, are their bias in favour of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations and the conscious and sub-conscious belief that the ancient Indo-Europeans were blue eyed Nordics and a European home must be found to them. Even Gordon Childe is not free from it[155]. Thus it was essential for them, till at least 1952[156], that the advent of the Aryans in India, should not be dated before 15th century B.C. This date was started as a pure hypothesis by F. Max Müller, who himself acknowledged the force of criticism of H.H. Wilson, W.D. Whitney, Barthelemy St. Hillaire[157]. A majority of scholars, in the West (Dr. E. J. Thomas being one of the few exceptions) have acted on the dogma that Max Müller has proved this date; and this subjective desire has been reinforced with the wish to, somehow, show that the barbarian hordes of Aryas destroyed the Indus Civilization in the 15th century B.C. Not one of them has offered any evidence for this dating of the Vedas, and they ignore completely the arguments advanced by other scholars, based on irrefutable evidence, of passages relating to *ṛtus*, months, years and sacrifices Nakṣatras and the solstices connected with them, discussed in the Vedic literature[158]. So far as the Christian Missionaries are concerned, the religious bias is open, as all their efforts to propagate 'Western Christianity' have not borne fruit inspite of an effort lasting two centuries under the most favourable circumstances which are still continuing. The fear entertained by them is aptly described by Fredrick Bodmer, "the custodians of Pentatuech were alarmed by the prospect that Sanskrit would bring down the Tower of Babel[159]". It is also obvious that all the Western World, not excluding the Soviet Union does not want to see India develop into a powerful country[160]. All these factors are responsible for the attitudes displayed by modern western writers on India. This is not to deny that India have many weaknesses and defects which must be removed if we are to progress; on the other hand we are not so backward as we have been frequently depicted.

---

[155] V. Gordon Childe, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, 1958, pp. 188-89 and *The Aryans*, 1926, pp. 207-212 (specially p. 212).

[156] Up to 1952 it was believed that the Indo-Europeans did not arrive in Greece till the 12th century B.C. Then Michael Ventris deciphered the Linear B Script and showed that the language used in the tablets was an early form of Greek, at least 500 years older than the Ionian of Homer. Now all the scholars maintain that (a) Greek started as a dialect of Indo-European in the middle of the third millennium B.C., A.J. Beattie, *Companion to Homer*, 1962, p. 311 (b) that Luwian Speaking Indo-Europeans arrived in Anatolia in the 29th cent. B.C. (James Mellaart, *Camb. Ancient History*, Vol. I, Ch. XVIII (revised), 1962, pp. 58-59, (c) Greek speaking Indo-Europeans could also have accompanied the Luwians in the 23rd century B.C. and entered Anatolia also at the same time (James Mellaret, *Op. cit.*) and (d) that Indo-Europeans entered Greece not later than 2,300 B.C. (Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, 1965, Chicago, p. 305, 391-392). Also see G.K. Hammond, *History of Greece*, 1959, pp 36-41, 56-57 brings the Greeks in Macedonia and Thessaly in 2500 B.C.

[157] Max Muller had first suggested this chronology in his *Hist. of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, 1859, p. and *Preface to the Text of the Ṛgveda*, Vol. IV, 1862, pp. v-vii. Wilson's criticism is cited by Max Muller, *Ibid*, vol. IV, p. VIII and *Edinburgh Review*, 1860, p. 357. Max Muller agreed with every word of his critics and remarked, "Whether the Vedic hymns were composed in 1000, or 1500 or 2000 or 3000 years B.C. no power on earth will ever determine." The advocates of the 15th century B.C. conveniently ignore this admission of Max Muller.

---

[158] Regarding the astronomical, ritualistic and historical arguments for ascribe a high antiquity 4000 B.C. to the Vedic civilization and the advent of the Aryans (if they did arrive from outside India), see B.G. Tilak, *Orion*, 1893, *Gitārahasya* Hindi Tr. 9th Ed. 1950, pp. 549-550; H. Jacobi, 'On the Date of the Rgveda', Eng. Tr. in *Indian Antiquary*, 1894, vol. 23, pp. 154-159, Antiquity of Vedic Culture, *Jour. of Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, pp. 721-726. JRAS, 1910, pp. 456-464; see specially his remarks on the astronomical pretensions of A.B. Keith. P.C. Sen Gupta, *Ancient Iudian Chronology*, 1947. B.V. Kameswara Aiyar, *Quarterly Jour. of Mythic Soc.*, Vol. XII, 1921-22, pp. 171-193, 223-246, 357-366.

[159] Bhagwaddatta, *Bhāratavarṣa kā Bṛhat Itihāsa*, where he quotes on page 38, from *The Loom of Language*, 1944, p. 174, New York.

[160] In June 1947, the present writer personally heard some British Officers of the Government of India, who were retiring, on receiving princely compensations, telling their bearers not to be worried as they would be back within 'six months'. On meeting one of them some years later, when he came out with the British Mission for negotiating the Durgapur Steel Project, the present writer asked him whether the 'six months' were to be interpreted in the same sense as

XXVI. It is hoped that the facts narrated in this paper will open the eyes of the younger set of Indian Indologists, many of whom, to the surprise of the present writer, seem to be unaware of the pitfalls into which they have been led and are being led. As true historians they must develop a spirit of as complete objectivity as is humanly possible, and steer clear not only of the blind prejudices of obscurantists, but also of the malicious prejudices displayed by most of the Western Indologists.

---

have been interpreting the 'six' days in which God is declared to have created the Universe, in order to reconcile them with billions of years demanded by science. There was, naturally, no reply.

APPENDIX TO PARA IX

Some parts of the *Old Testament* are undoubtedly magnificient. *The Book of Job*, perhaps the finest poetry in the entire *Old Testament*, vividly describes the ordeal of job:

> "Man that is born of a woman
> Is of a few days, and full of trouble.
> He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down;
> He fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not,
> And dost thou open thine eyes upon such a one,
> And bringest me into judgement with the?...
> For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
> And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
>
> ... ...
>
> The waters are gone from the sea,
> And the river decayeth and drieth up;
> So man lieth down and riseth not;
> Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
> Nor be roused out of sleep."

But the magnificience of the poetry, and the later development of the humane portions of the Hebrew code, should not blind one to the barbarism and savagery, the cruelty and the obscenity which pervades most of the *Old Testament*, a few examples of which are cited below:

(a) *The story of Lot* (*Genesis* XIX.8): The fathers could dispose of their daughters at will; anyone on payment to him could enjoy them sexually. The Heavenly beings ("sons of Elohim") visit Lot the nephew of Abraham; and a lot of scoundrals besiege this house and demand that the guests be handed over to them for homosexual purposes.

Lot replies to them, "Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes; only unto these men do nothing; for as much as they are come under the shadow of my roof."

(b) *Judges XIX*. A levite and his concubine were entertained by her father, in the territory of the tribe of Benjamin. A mob surrounds them and threatens bestialities. The father therefore offers his daughter to them, and the husband looks supinely on. A night of indiscriminate raping follows; the woman dies. The husband thereupon flies into a rage cuts up her body into twelve parts, and sends them throughout Israel *(Judges* V.29*)*.

(c) Lots daughters committ incest with him, after getting him drunk (*Genesis* XIX. 30-38).

(d) The prophet Isaiah stated that his god had to walk in public, with buttocks exposed. (*Isiah*, XX, 2-4); similarly the prophet Ezekeil reeleved an order from God, to bake his cake in human excrement (*Ezek*. IV).

(e) Abraham told Abimelech that Sarah was his half sister but did not reveal that she was also his wife (*Genesis* XX.2). So Abimelech added her to his harem. God thereupon did not punish Abraham for fraud but warned Abimelech in a dream that unless he released her, he would be visited with divine displeasure, and this was actually inflicted as the other wives of his were inflicted with temporary sterility. This means a fairly long interval between the entry of Sarah into the harem and the visit of God's displeasure! (*Genesis* XX.11-13).

(f) Moses commanded, in the name of God, the utter destruction of Caanan by Beni-Israel. All 'males' were to be slaughtered but Beni-Israel could keep the women and children for their own use. (*Deuteronomy* XX.13-15).

(g) Prophet Samuel, in accordance with the command of God, directed Saul to, slay the Amalkelites, "Both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass" (*I. Samuel* XV.3).

(h) According to the rules of the Church of England, two lessons from the *Book of Kings* (*2 Kings* IX and X) - of the *Old Testament*, have to be read. We learn from these, that Prophet Elisha sent an assistant of his to Ramoth-giled, annoint Jehu, (son of one 'Nimshi') an utter scoundral, king of Israel. This gangster, nothing loath, hurried off at once to Jezreel, where Joram, the reigning monarch of Israel was residing and murdered the king and his guest, Ahaziah, King of Judah, while they were riding in their chariots. He then ordered, that Jezebel, mother of Joram to be thrown out of the window of her palace by his eunuchs. She died as a result of the fall and her corpse was devoured by dogs. Next he put the seventy sons of King Ahab to death and had their heads brought to him in baskets. Afterwards he slaughtered the rest of the kit and kin of Ahab. He capped all this by the massacre of all those who worshipped the Phoenician god 'Baal', and who were residents of the kingdom of Samaria. These acts bestial cruelty not only did not bring down on him the punishment of god of the *Old Testament*, but on the contrary brought him rewards. For Yahweh, the Lord God of Hosts told him that he had done right in his (Yahweh's) eyes, and that as a consequence his descendents until the fourth generation will hold sway over Israel (*2 Kings* X.30).

(i) The prophets are fond allegorising Israel, as a faithless wife who went 'a-whoring after other gods'. The details of sexual infidelity are expatiated in such detail as to be matched only by the detective literature coming out of the United States of America in these days of modern enlightenment. The Prophet Ezekeil seems to be the worst offender in this respect. His lustful imagery of the two courtsens 'Oholah (Samaria) and 'Oholibah' (Jerusalem) leaves nothing to imagination. (*Ezekeil* XXIII).

(j) The Hebrew word for woman simply refers to the sexual interest a man has in her. In the Hebrew Civilization, woman was merely a piece of property. Adultry, as defined in the *Old Testament*, meant robbing a Man of his sexual goods and chattals. The Fourth commandment forbids the coveting of a man's wife, donkey, and ox. No commandment forbids the coveting of the husband of one woman by another woman, as a wrong done by her to his wife. The Hebrew word which is usually translated 'covet' means more than envy (see *Exodus* XX.17 and xxxiv.24).

(k) In *Num* . vi, a strange rite is inflicted on a woman suspected of infidelity. A magic test is supplied. The husband takes the wife to a priest, who takes an earthen pot containing holy water. Dust from the floor of the Tabernacle is put into the water. The woman's hair is loosened and a meal offering of jealousy" is placed in her hand. Having sworn innocence the woman drinks the "water of bitterness", and after the priest has cursed and written it down in a scroll and washed it off into the water. If the woman is guilty of infidelity, her belly will swell and her thighs would rot. The justification for such laws and rules is that the prophet Ezekel represents God as declaring, "statues that were not good, and judgingements wherein they should not live." (*Ezek.* xx.25).

(l) An appreciable number of psalms in the *Old Testament* breathe extreme hatred and cruelty. For example in psalm cix, the poet prays to God to visit his dire vengeance on the guilty and the innocent alike, "Set though a wicked man over him; and let an adversary stand at his right hand. When he is judged, let him come forth guilty: and let his prayer be turned into sin. Let his days be few: and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children be vagabonds and beg; and let them seek (their bread) out of their desolate places......neither let there be any to have mercy on his fatherless children." (*Ps.* CIX. 6-12).

(m) The New Testament breathes a more humane air than the Old. Yet even in the former is taught the doctrine of eternal damnation and torture for those who have sinned and the unbelievers.

(n) Samuel the Israelite, after gaining the victory of Michmash (*Samuel* xiii.3) sacrificed by his own hands, the defeated Philistine Ruler, Amakelite, to Yahweh (God of the Hebrews). Yet Dr. Hall (Ancient Hist. of the Near East, 1960, p. 425) declares, "Samuel's action cannot be judged by modern standards." But Europeans will not extend this grace to other Asiatics.

(o) Archaeological excavations in Palestine, has shown that 'innumerable children were sacrificed and their remains buried in pots beneath buildings. (vide H.R. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, 1960, p. 442).

E.143
2368